**IN THE HIGH COURT OF KERALA AT ERNAKULAM**

**PRESENT :**

**THE HONOURABLE MR. JUSTICE ANTONY DOMINIC**

**TUESDAY, THE 18TH SEPTEMBER 2007 / 27TH BHADRA 1929**

**WP(C).No. 26142 of 2007(K)**
**----------**

**PETITIONER:**
**----------**

**KISHORE KUMAR, AGED 23 YEARS,**
**S/O. K.C. KRISHNAN KUTTY, KARUTHAVAKA HOUSE,**
**MANIKKATHUPADI, GURUVAYOOR.**

**BY ADV. SRI.RAJIT**
**SRI.RANJIT BABU**

**RESPONDENTS:**
**----------**

**1. UNIVERSITY OF CALICUT,**
**CALICUT UNIVERSITY P.O., REPRESENTED BY**
**THE REGISTRAR.**

**2. REGISTRAR,**
**CALICUT UNIVERSITY, CALICUT UNIVERSITY P.O.**

**3. SREE KRISHNA COLLEGE,**
**ARIYANNUR, CHAVAKKAD, THRISSUR (UNDER THE**
**MANAGEMENT OF GURUVAYOOR DEVASWOM, GURUVAYOOR).**

**BY SRI.P.C.SASIDHARAN, SC, CALICUT UNIVERSITY**

**THIS WRIT PETITION (CIVIL) HAVING COME UP FOR ADMISSION ON 18/09/2007, THE COURT ON THE SAME DAY DELIVERED THE FOLLOWING:**

**ANTONY DOMINIC, J.**
**==========**
**W.P.(C) NO. 26142 OF 2007**
**==========**

**Dated this the 18th day of September, 2007**

**J U D G M E N T**

The prayer sought for in this writ petition is to quash Ext.P3 to the extent of denying admission to the petitioner to the degree course conducted by respondents 1 and 2. Petitioner also seeks a direction to admit him in degree course of the 1st respondent University.

2. From the facts, it is disclosed that the petitioner completed his HSE in Tamilnadu (private study) during March 1999 and is now seeking admission in the academic year 2007-08. It appears that the University had already decided that candidates who have qualified the HSE of Tamilnadu (private study), after 7.7.07 will not be eligible for admission. The correctness of that policy decision came to be examined by this Court in WP(C) 22790/05 and

connected cases. Based on the observations contained in the judgment, as a one time measure, the University made a relaxation and decided that candidates who have passed the examination before 7/7/07 will be permitted to seek admission in the degree courses in the academic year 2006-07 as a last chance. Even this chance was not availed of by the petitioner and it is now contented that he should be allowed admission in the year 2007-08.

3. I do not find any reason to interfere with the decision of the University. I should also mention that in the judgment in WP(C) 22790/05, this court did not interfere with the correctness of the decision of the University, but only suggested that the grievance of those, who have passed before 7.7.07 should be taken care of and this has been done by the University by allowing such students to seek admission in the academic year 2006-07. If the

petitioner did not avail of the chance, he can only blame himself. But the policy decision of the University cannot be held to be bad for that reason.

Writ petition lacks merit and is dismissed.

**ANTONY DOMINIC, JUDGE.**

Rp